

## TS-EAS - EAC-CPF team

**Place:** Virtual meeting, Zoom

**Date:** Friday, 31 January 2020, 7am Boston/12am London/1pm Berlin/11pm Melbourne

**Participants:** Ailie, Caitlin, Karin, Kerstin, Mark, Silke

### Minutes

#### 1) Announcements

Clinton will no longer be able to participate on TS-EAS. He was assigned to proposed for authorized agency codes and record identifiers.

Wim will no longer be joining for meetings, but he is willing to continue to support us.

#### 2) Joint meeting EAC-CPF, EAD, Schema teams (Silke)

##### 1) decisions: We made some big decisions.

- removing xlink namespace approved
- add attribute according to EAD3 data model (availability and value/data type):  
@audience, @encodinganalog, @countryencoding, @langencoding,  
@repositoryencoding, @scriptencoding, @relatedencoding, @listtype, @mark,  
@numeration, @instanceurl  
Kerstin clarifies that @encodinganalog is not available in all elements but those records that crosswalk to another standard.
- add available attribute @countrycode to //maintenanceAgency

##### 2) open issues:

- removing xml namespace with regard to scope of @base, this will be part of the EAD3 reconciliation
- add attributes according to EAD3 but consider data model for EAC-CPF: @lang, @script, @transliteration --> flagged for Chicago meeting  
Decision about @lang, @script, and @transliteration will be under the same data model as EAD3 but only for elements that contain texts (i.e., non-empty elements as outlined in the document). Mark adds that we should look at this perhaps a little closer step-by-step. Kerstin agrees that we should review repeatability and use in both standards. Silke asks if we can add this to Chicago, and Kerstin agrees that Chicago would be a good option for this discussion.
- make attribute @localtype to all shared elements in EAC-CPF and vice versa: identify elements --> flagged for virtual meeting after Berlin  
@localtype will be made available to all elements that contain texts. The action item here might be to align EAC/EAD3 in their use of @localtype. Kerstin adds that this may be a good additional item in Chicago to discuss where @localtype and @encodinganalog could be applied. Silke suggests that this may be after Berlin or virtual meetings as well, but we need to identify the elements and a rule for it so that it can be applied for EAC (we will tackle after Berlin).
- add attribute according to EAD3 but consider data model:
  - @dateencoding: add value for EDTF? --> no  
Date encoding: Should EDTF be added as an attribute to date encoding?  
Karin says that EDTF/ISOL will be being combined, but do we want to follow

the suggestion for adding EDTF? Kerstin adds that for this reason in the technical standard, we should keep it as it is. Silke: So we agree to keep it as it is.

- @encodingalanog: add to which elements? --> flagged for virtual meeting after Berlin
  - @relatedencoding: add to //eac-cpf, //control, //cpfDescription? --> agreed @relatedEncoding: Should EAC take up the @relatedEncoding for <cpfDescription> assuming that is the logical counterpart to the <archdesc> element in EAD? Mark asks if the element also needs to be available in <relations> and if <relations> is in <cpfDescription>. Mark adds that he's not sure that encoding analogs need to be included in the schema, but there is a history there. Discussion about the usage of relatedEncoding in relations--does it go in multiple identities in control in EAC that way you don't have to specify multiple identities.
  - define date encoding for EAC-CPF in comparison to EAD3, postpone all decisions on date encoding --> date encoding for EAC-CPF will be discussed in Berlin, date encoding for all schemas is flagged for TS-EAS meeting in Chicago
- Date encoding for EAC-CPF and EAD3. We have the encoding we want for dates in EAC-CPF, so EAD3 is the next step. Kerstin adds that she understands the <date> vs <datesingle> can be included in the topics list for Berlin. We need to try to find a better way to encode dates on the EAD reconciliation side. Karin adds that we need to find a good middle ground so that we don't introduce a third way for finding dates. Silke adds that even if we keep in EAC the way it is, we do need a way to explain the decision. Silke asks if we need to discuss date in Berlin? Kerstin clarifies that in Berlin, Schema group would like to discuss <control> as a launch, and date would be covered as part of that conversation. We probably could bring it to a point at Berlin where we have a solution for EAC-CPF and plan to look at dates again in Chicago with the foundation from Berlin in order to determine the way forward in EAD. Karin adds that we might break date into two steps, first attribute alignment (Berlin) and then content model (Chicago). The model will definitely come to bear on the EAC-F schema, so we will need to reconcile at some point.

### 3) GitHub (Silke)

Silke is working in GitHub to create a single issue per element or attribute for EAC-CPF with agreed solution so far. This does not require comments at the moment, but we will talk in Berlin about these individual issues.

### 4) Topic: Names (Silke)

Silke had homework for December meeting on how to ask institution/agencies in France, Spain, Italy, and the United States about how to encode authorized names in EAC-CPF. However, we've gotten no responses. We can plan to ask during Berlin and if we don't get any answer then it's up to us and we will wait for community feedback during the call for comments.

### 5) [Topic: Assertion Description](#) (Mark)

Revision on adding evidence information to the data model, but perhaps in a much simplified form from the initial proposals from Daniel Pitti.

New revision suggests adding two elements and one attribute:

- **evidence** (0 to unbounded)

- **@fromSource** (required. Expected to provide a link from the newly-available evidence element to one of the source elements listed in the control section)
- **@id**
- **citedRange** (0 to unbounded)
  - **@unit** (optional. can be used to specify where the cited range of materials represents a page number, volume number, etc. This attribute is already available in EAD)
  - **@id, @lang, @script, @transliteration**
- [text]
- **descriptiveNote** (0 to 1)

Portions highlighted in yellow indicate where other requirements might be fulfilled by adding custom attributes from other namespaces in the schema more broadly.

Mark notes that this will allow folks to use sources who have been opting for TEI over EAC for this functionality in specific.

1. Is the simpler approach preferred to what was proposed in drafts 1 and 2?

- a. Answers: Silke likes this approach and would take it as it is to the community for feedback. Most of the elements in <cpfDescription> will have to be repeatable if we implement this, correct? Mark adds that you would want these to be repeatable in the case where you have multiple assertions. Mark adds that he was moving away from mixed content wherever possible, so we may need to consider how this proposal would affect that effort. Silke asks if we should take the Mixed Content question in Berlin, but Mark adds that this would be a big question in EAD. Karin agrees the simpler, the easier. Karin adds we may want to clean up the examples to remove SNAC attributes and keep them simple. RiC-O may incorporate evidenceRelation, but this would complicate the schema and introduce other issues.
- b. Silke suggests that the next step is to bring that solution to Berlin and let's find new names in Berlin. Then we can bring the relations question to Aaron, then find general solutions for reference attributes, and at the end if we introduce @fromSource then we can reuse that attribute in other places. Let's find agreement in the team and bring that to comment at the very end. We currently have the afternoon of the first day blocked for issues like these, so we can discuss then during Berlin.

6) Any other business (all)

a) SAA Standards Committee

Karin adds that there was a standards call two weeks ago about minor/major revisions, and they have decided that they want very full GitHub requests to track the changes. The work on GitHub will be read in detail, so should be clearly tracking as closely as possible. The request is currently that we might need an appendix that outlines each change in the major revision process. For minor revisions, we will need to submit a form for each revision for review, and we can link to GitHub in this process. Silke asks if we need an annotation declaring if the revision is minor or major. Silke provides an example: <https://github.com/SAA-SDT/eac-cpf-schema/issues/133>. SAA standards is hoping to require us to go through review before minor revisions. Mark adds that the schema solution may not be necessary, but that these look good as is. Kerstin asks if Standards will provide examples of what is major or minor? Standards is holding that even optional attributes will be major revisions. Any schema changes will be major changes. Tag library changes may also be seen in major. Karin adds that this is more a DACS question than an EAS question. Before we can release, we need updates approved by council. We need to submit

all the GitHub issues and we need to show them that there are external reviewers. We need additionally once review by the public, so we need to be reviewed after a call for comments. This will not require two sets of approval for the tag library and the schema.

b) Berlin meeting

Check in on travel plans for Berlin meetings. Agendas will be sent on February 10th.

Mark will prepare a short presentation for Berlin on the Assertion Description topic.

Mark asks if anyone is tapped to write a report of the Berlin meeting? We might have someone from Standards do a summary/write-up for the meeting. Adrian asked this question as well. We will have the minutes and we can imagine someone will volunteer for a short article for the website again as we did in Austin. Mark will say that from our respective it would be helpful to have a liaison there, but for these purposes he could just attend the Chicago meeting.

c) Webinars

Are we still planning to make a white paper on all of our topics? After the Berlin meeting, Mark and Karin will have a webinar on TS-EAS's work. A white paper would help support the outreach team, so we can see if we can put that together after Berlin.

Webinars: Currently, there are two time slots: one good for Europe and US. However, maybe we

7) Next meeting

- Friday, 28 February 2020, 7am Boston/12am London/1pm Berlin/11pm Melbourne to prepare Berlin meeting, Aaron and Gerhard are supposed to attend